

14 July 1955

MEMORANDUM FOR: Special Assistant to the Director
for Planning and Coordination

SUBJECT: USIA Membership on the IAC

1. Current interest in the above subject is prompted by the increasing mention of it by Henry Loomis, on one occasion I believe to yourself, and prior to my vacation his inquiry as to whether I thought the best approach was for Mr. Streibert to write to the Director.

2. To refresh one's mind, Part 3 of the USIA survey said on this subject:

"j. USIA should not become a member of the IAC at this time because:

(1) It is not believed that the contribution which USIA could make to the National Intelligence Estimates is one which would be sufficiently different from the contributions of the present IAC members.

(2) The interagency arrangements recommended by this report can be effected without USIA membership on the IAC.

(3) Whenever matters within the purview of USIA are to be discussed by the IAC, the DCI can invite USIA participation, as provided in NSCID-1. (Similar USIA representation should be obtained by the IAC subcommittees on basic intelligence defectors, and foreign language publications.)

"k. The question of IAC membership should be reexamined after a sufficient amount of time has passed for the implementation of this report."

3. The recent NIE 100-5-55 attached hereto contains contributions of USIA from their polling operation. Henry would argue that this contribution is an example of USIA's unique type of intelligence obtained through polling and is

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

sufficiently different from the contributions of the present IAC members and of such substantial importance as to warrant membership. Henry has from time to time chafed at what he calls the "second citizen" status of USIA with regard to the acquisition and utilization of intelligence as regards the IAC community. We have on every occasion sought to prevent discrimination arising from non-IAC membership. While there are minor irritations the two major ones which may have more psychological than real effects upon USIA are as follows:

a. The fact that the IAC must assent to the dissemination to USIA of each National Estimate based on IAC judgment of what USIA needs and the sensitivity of the estimate.

50X1

5. In the case of the attached estimate, ONE did invite USIA participation as indicated in paragraph j3 above and this may also be true in other cases. It is our information that USIA representation on the IAC subcommittees has satisfactorily provided for their participation.

6. You will recall that sometime ago I discussed with you the possibility of an annual report on the extent of implementation of the USIA survey report. At first blush this appealed to Howe and Loomis, the latter avowedly looking upon this primarily as a vehicle through which the reexamination of IAC membership for USIA (alluded to in K above) could take place. I have since cooled off on this idea (though it would not be too hard to persuade me otherwise) because it seems to me the implementation has proved rapid and effective with no major problems and is conclusive except for international communism and IAC membership. The first is being handled separately and the second is the subject of this discussion.

CONFIDENTIAL

7. In addition to the reasons listed in j above with regard to why USIA should not become a member of the IAC at the time the survey was completed, which I still believe to be valid, I also was of the firm conviction that a proposal for USIA membership at that time would be so unpopular among intelligence agencies that the major theses of our report would be jeopardized. I still believe this was a correct judgment. The question today is whether the USIA contribution to estimates and possibly to collection can be made sufficiently impressive to the IAC members to override their resistance to such membership which I anticipate will rest on the following grounds, however, unspoken:

a. The IAC is already too big and to add another agency would make it even more so.

b. USIA's case is really not substantially different from that which could have been or has been made by FOA, FCDA and Treasury and accordingly if we allowed USIA into the IAC we would be liable for requests from these other agencies. Some of the foregoing agencies have a status on the NSC and OCB comparable to that of USIA.

c. The USIA's main business is to pass information out to the public through radio and printed matter. Accordingly, USIA is not as secure as the other agencies now members of the IAC and the discussion of sensitive matters would have to be avoided in the IAC.

8. To the foregoing arguments USIA could reply that USIA is much more closely tied to the national security area than the other possible contenders for IAC membership; that the basis for membership should rest on the merits of the case and not whether the IAC is too big; that the recent publications produced for the President by Mr. Rockefeller's office which embrace USIA polling results and the contribution of USIA to the previously mentioned recent estimate (of which more can be expected) constitute a unique contribution which is not made now by any other agency. As for security it would be pointed out that USIA's security standards are as high as any other agency.

9. I do not feel that USIA membership is essential either to the IAC or USIA. In my opinion the question is mainly a political one of what can be done at this time.

10. The IAC at this time will be most likely loathe to admit USIA to membership. I do believe that the passage of time (as USIA, as it may, gains strength and demonstrates its contributions to intelligence both in estimates

CONFIDENTIAL

and in matters of collection) will tend to soften the resistance of the intelligence agencies. It may, however, serve as a useful purpose for Streibert to address a letter to the Director asking that a reexamination of this question be made now indicating the reasons from his point of view why membership on the IAC is desirable and important. Even if the IAC rejected the request it would have served to bring the matter to the attention of the IAC and perhaps contribute to a more favorable consideration at a later date.

11. Recommendation:

That I be instructed to inform Leemis that it would be our advice that he should prepare for Mr. Streibert's signature a letter to the Director along the lines indicated above.

JAMES G. REBER
Office of the Director
Planning and Coordination Staff

Attachment

PCS/DCHJGR:aml (14 July 1955)

- 1 - addressee**
- 1 - PCS/DCI**
- 1 - PCS/DCI Chrono**